

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

13 April 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR: DTR

FROM : Chief/JOTP

SUBJECT : Critique of Supervisory Reorientation Program

JOB NO. FLD NO. DOC. NO. 7 NO CHANGE
 IN CLASS ~~X~~ DECLASS // CLASS CHANGED TO: TS S C RET. JUST. 22
 NEXT REV DATE ~~02/25~~ REV DATE ~~02/25~~ REVIEWER ~~02/25~~ TYPE DOC. 02
 NO. PGS 2 CREATION DATE ORG COMP // OPI // ORG CLASS C
 REV CLASS C REV COORD. AUTH: RR 763

[redacted] and I have discussed our impressions of last Friday's program, and offer the following comments.

25X1A9a

a. The Director. His participation lent strength and authority to the proceedings. Hopefully he can be persuaded to appear in subsequent programs; but in any case it is important that supervisors realize his seriousness of purpose in requesting such a review.

b. Colonel White. An excellent statement, reflecting his own convictions as to fairness and firmness in supervision as well as his knowledge of management doctrine. However, without weakening the case for "Theory Y", he might have developed a bit more the kinds of situations in which the supervisor has to apply "Theory X".

c. Dr. Tietjen. A well-balanced presentation, unexpectedly effective in its philosophical treatment of environment factors. It would be useful to have more specific guidance as to when a supervisor should refer an employee for medical review or advice.

d. Mr. Fuchs. Made many excellent points, but his subject was treated too much from the certifying officer point of view. The technical responsibilities of supervisors with respect to finance were overstressed, and it is very probable that supervisors without overseas experience would miss a number of his references. It would be better if more stress

This document part of classified integrated file. NAME CHECK required prior to individual classification action.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CONFIDENTIAL

were put upon the supervisor's responsibility to note and correct the all-too-frequent instances of petty chiseling, e.g. padding expense accounts, personal use of government-owned equipment and materials, which erode employee morale and supervisory discipline.

e. Security Office speaker. A good presentation but obviously aimed more at individual employee awareness than at supervisory responsibility. If it is to continue as a part of the supervisory reorientation program this emphasis should be changed.

f. Mr. Echols. An excellent summary of current regulations and handbooks but overly didactic, impersonal and procedural for the occasion. Here is where the supervisor's leadership and counseling role should be stressed, and the main aspects of his responsibility recapped.

g. The Panel. Well handled, and particularly good in that all questions, good or bad, got a hearing. However, we doubt that it is worth the time and question whether it should be a feature of an Agency-wide program at all levels. A summary by the Director of Personnel of the salient points made during the day probably would suffice.

h. Overall. A good program, but should be shortened by including by reference rather than by repeating material which is already in Agency regulatory publications.

[Redacted Box]
25X1A9a